



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,729	02/07/2002	Wen-Sung Tsai	CEIP0037USA	8659

27765 7590 12/31/2002

NAIPO (NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE)
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

LUU, MATTHEW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/683,729	TSAI, WEN-SUNG <i>W</i>
	Examiner LUU MATTHEW	Art Unit 2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2002.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (6,147,664).

Regarding claim 1, Hansen discloses (Figs. 7-10) a display device for a computer system comprises a screen (200) for displaying a color picture image for a user in front of the screen, the color picture image formed by light emitted from at least two light sources (the pixels of the flat panel screen); at least one sensor (580) for detecting light around the screen and generating a corresponding detecting signal; a gray level adjusting device (Fig. 9, brightness control circuitry 300) for adjusting brightness of light emitted by the screen; and a controller (processor 501) for controlling operations of the display device.

Hansen fails to disclose at least two light sources of different colors. However, it is well known in the art that the light sources of the flat panel are the color pixels (R, G, B) of the flat panel screen that displays different colors.

Regarding claim 2, Hansen discloses (Fig. 7) the sensor (580a) is disposed at a front side of the display device.

Regarding claim 3, Hansen discloses (Fig. 9) a brightness control circuitry (300).

Regarding claim 5, Hansen discloses the FED flat panel display screen. However, it is well-known in the art that the LCD flat panel display screen and the FED flat panel display screen are interchangeable.

3. Claims 6-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (6,147,664) as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Hirose et al (5,032,828).

Regarding claim 6, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 1 and the Hansen reference (6,147,664). Hansen fails to disclose the light sensor is disposed on the back of the display device.

However, Hirose et al (5,032,828) disclose (Figs. 6 and 7) the light sensor (34) is disposed in the front of the LCD panel (34); and the light sensor (37) is disposed in the back of the display panel (34). It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of positioning the light sensor as various positions relative to the display screen of Hirose into the display device of Hansen in the interests of ergonomic and appealing appearance design. Furthermore, Hansen also mentions that "The ambient light sensor 580 can be placed within a number of positions within the present invention and positions 580a and 580b are exemplary only." See column 14, lines 27-31.

Regarding claims 7 and 9, Hansen discloses (Fig. 9) a brightness control circuitry (300).

Regarding claim 8, Hirose discloses (Fig. 1) the sensor (16) detects color light.

Regarding claim 10, Hansen discloses (Fig. 9) the brightness of light detected by the sensor is compared to a predetermined value (reference voltage 635).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Hirose discloses (Fig. 1) a color control circuit (17).

Regarding claim 14, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 5.

4. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Hirose as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Kikinis (5,416,610).

Regarding claims 4 and 13, Hansen and Hirose fail to disclose a display controller card. However, Kikinis discloses a display controller card (Display Driver VGA (47) in a LCD display device. It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use the VGA controller card of Kikinis into the portable computer of Hansen for the purpose of reducing the weight of the portable computer with the advantage of easy portability.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Beeteson et al (6,052,118) disclose a display system with a photo detector (160).

-DiBella et al (5,216,493) disclose a multipoint digital automatic white balance system that automatically compensates for changes in illumination conditions.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUU MATTHEW whose telephone number is (703) 305-4850. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RAZAVI MICHAEL can be reached on (703) 305-4713. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

M. Luu
December 27, 2002



MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER